

To investigate the question of surface brightness conservation during (weak and strong) lensing, by using an isothermal sphere as example, let b be the the impact parameter of a ray in the presence of the clump, and b_0 that of a ray from the same source point in the absence of the clump. Then evidently

$$b_0 = b - L\psi(b), \quad (1)$$

where we defined

$$L = \frac{x_l(x_s - x_l)}{(1 + z_l)x_s}. \quad (2)$$

Now consider a small element of the source, corresponding to an element of area of the lensing plane defined by radial and transverse intervals db_0 and $b_0 d\varphi$. Its area is $dA_0 = b_0 db_0 d\varphi$. When the clump is in place, the rays from this element pass through another element with area $dA = b db d\varphi$. The (areal) magnification of this element due to lensing is by definition

$$X = \left| \frac{dA}{dA_0} \right| = \left| \frac{b db}{b_0 db_0} \right|. \quad (3)$$

The modulus signs are needed of course because the ratio can be negative when images are reversed.

Thus the reciprocal magnification is

$$X^{-1} = \left| \frac{b_0 db_0}{b db} \right|, \quad (4)$$

and from (1) we then find explicitly

$$X^{-1} = \left| 1 - L \left(\frac{\psi}{b} + \frac{d\psi}{db} \right) + L^2 \frac{\psi d\psi}{b db} \right|. \quad (5)$$

Of course, if the lensing is weak, then $X \approx 1 + 2\eta$, with

$$2\eta = L \left(\frac{\psi}{b} + \frac{d\psi}{db} \right). \quad (6)$$

Another way of expressing the definition (3) is in terms of the flux ratio. If the source temperature is T , the flux through the area element in the two cases is

$$df_0 = \sigma T^4 \frac{(1 + z_l)^2}{x_l^2} dA_0, \quad df = \sigma T^4 \frac{(1 + z_l)^2}{x_l^2} dA, \quad (7)$$

so we could write

$$X = \frac{df}{df_0}. \quad (8)$$

So long as we are talking about an infinitesimal element, there is clearly no possibility of violating the conservation of surface brightness, nor any distinction between flux distance and area distance. Is there any reason to think that there could be a violation for larger areas?

Let's examine the case of a spherically symmetric lens of total mass M directly in front of a large circular source. Suppose that without the lens the source covers a circle of radius B_0 on the lensing plane, where B_0 is larger than the radius R of the lensing mass. When the lens is present, the source will then appear expanded to the radius B , where

$$B_0 = B - L\psi(B) = B - \frac{4GML}{B}. \quad (9)$$

Without the lens, the total flux from the source is

$$F_0 = \sigma T^4 \pi B_0^2 \frac{(1 + z_l)^2}{x_l^2}. \quad (10)$$

With the lens, assuming surface brightness is conserved, it is

$$F = \sigma T^4 \pi B^2 \frac{(1 + z_l)^2}{x_l^2}. \quad (11)$$

If B is large (compared to $\sqrt{4GML}$), then the increase in flux is

$$F - F_0 = 8\pi\sigma T^4 GML \frac{(1 + z_l)^2}{x_l^2}, \quad (12)$$

depending only on the total mass of the lens.

What we have to show, to demonstrate consistency, is that this extra flux is precisely what we should expect from the magnification of the central parts of the image — including strong lensing at the center. To be more precise, if we take each small element of area dA_0 of the *unlensed* surface, multiply it by the appropriate magnification factor X given by (5) and then integrate to add up these contributions, the result should be precisely the total area

of the surface including the effect of lensing. In our case, this means we have to verify that

$$\int_0^{B_0} 2\pi b_0 db_0 X_{\text{tot}}(b_0) = \pi B^2. \quad (13)$$

For weakly lensed regions, X_{tot} is just the magnification X , but for those regions that are strongly lensed it is the *sum* of the magnifications of all (in this case two) images.

If the density profile is known, we can compute the scattering angle ψ as a function of b . For our present purposes, all we really need to know is the behaviour of $\psi(b)$ for very large and very small values of b . We have already noted that for large b ,

$$\psi(b) = \frac{4GM}{b}, \quad \text{for } b > R. \quad (14)$$

In the opposite limit, let us assume that at small b , as in the case of a singular isothermal sphere, ψ tends to a constant:

$$\psi(b) \approx \psi_0, \quad \text{for small } b. \quad (15)$$

We now need to separate out the region of strong lensing. The caustic which defines the boundary of the strong-lensing region is the circle of points that are images of the central spot (where the magnification is actually infinite). The limiting radius r_c is defined by the condition $b_0 = 0$, or, by (1),

$$r_c = L\psi(r_c). \quad (16)$$

For simplicity, let us assume that r_c is sufficiently small that ψ has already reached its limiting value ψ_0 , as in (15). Then obviously

$$r_c = L\psi_0. \quad (17)$$

For $b > r_c$ but close to it, we then have

$$b_0 = b - L\psi_0 = b - r_c. \quad (18)$$

When b becomes slightly less than r_c , the right hand side of (18) becomes negative. What this means is that in fact

$$b_0 = r_c - b, \quad (19)$$

but the source point is on the other side of the center to the image point, with values of φ differing by π ; images here are reversed. Thus for every $b_0 < r_c$ there are *two* image circles, with radii

$$b = r_c \pm b_0. \quad (20)$$

The central disc, of radius $b_0 = r_c$, is imaged twice, once onto the annulus between $b = r_c$ and $b = 2r_c$, and once, reversed, onto the disc $b < r_c$. In this central region, it's clear that $|db| = |db_0|$, so the magnifications of the two images are

$$X_{\pm} = \frac{b}{b_0} = \frac{r_c}{b_0} \pm 1. \quad (21)$$

Evidently therefore the total magnification of both images is

$$X_{\text{tot}} = X_+ + X_- = \frac{2r_c}{b_0}. \quad (22)$$

Hence the contribution of this region to the integral (13) is

$$\int_0^{r_c} 2\pi b_0 X_{\text{tot}}(b_0) db_0 = 4\pi r_c^2, \quad (23)$$

as we should expect.

For the weakly lensed region, $b > r_c$, we have to evaluate the integral

$$I = \int_{r_c}^{B_0} 2\pi b_0 X(b_0) db_0. \quad (24)$$

This is essentially trivial, because X by its definition is the Jacobian required to change variable from b_0 to b . Thus

$$I = \int_{2r_c}^B 2\pi b db = \pi B^2 - 4\pi r_c^2. \quad (25)$$

Adding in the contribution (23) from the central region, this shows that (13) is indeed satisfied.